



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,929	03/02/2004	Curtis B. Johnson	H0006338-0779	3823

7590 04/19/2006

Kris T. Fredrick
Honeywell International, Inc.
101 Columbia Rd.
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

BROWN, VERNAL U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/791,929	Applicant(s) JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Vernal U. Brown	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed on January 30, 2006.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claim 11.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 8, regarding the association of transceiver 68 with the latch 22, the transceiver is use to receiver identification signal for authenticating the operation of the latch (col. 4 line 64-col. 5 line 9).

Applicant's argument on page 8 regarding the interface component, elements 90 and 70 is the transceiver interface signal and the hardware component of the interface to the transceiver is provided by antenna 72.

Regarding applicant's argument on page 9 regarding the interpreter, the examiner considers the controller 66 as the functional equivalent to the interpreter as claimed. The controller received the response message and extracts the identification code from the received message and provide the control signal to the lock mechanism when the received security code matches the stored code (col. 4 line 65-col. 5 line 9). The controller therefore performs the interpreting function by translating the received message into a control signal to the lock.

Regarding applicant's argument on page ¹⁰14 regarding the interpreter comprises logic array, the reference of Steiner teaches the use of a microprocessor to perform the function of the

Art Unit: 2612

controller (col. 1 lines 51-53). The controller 66 also represents a circuit module that inherently includes an array of logic for implementing the circuit functions.

Regarding applicant's argument on page ~~10~~¹⁴ regarding the voltage level shifter, the reference of Heaston et al. teaches the use of a voltage level shifter in the form of a transistor for transforming a voltage to a desired level (col. 6 lines 21-30).

Regarding applicant's argument on pages 17-18 regarding claim 6, the reference of Knight is relied upon Knight et al. is relied upon for teaching the use of a UART in the vehicle communication interface (paragraph 00189) and the UART transmits in parallel by assembling the bit received into bytes and transmitting the assembled bytes to the processor (paragraph 0188). Knight et al. further teaches integrating the UART and having the UART separate (paragraph 0164)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steiner US Patent 6577226 in view of Lightner et al. US Patent 6732031.

Regarding claims 1-3, 11, 13-16, Steiner teaches a latch communications system (figure 2), comprising: a communications receiver and transmitter unit (68) associated with a latch (22);

Art Unit: 2612

an interface component (72) for interfacing with said communications receiver and transmitter unit (col. 4 lines 41-45, col. 4 lines 62-65), wherein said interface component is co-located with said communications receiver and transmitter unit in association with said latch in the vehicle door 18 as shown in figure 2; an interpreter (66) associated with the interface component and the communications and transmitter unit, wherein said interpreter processes information received from said communications receiver and transmitter unit in order to provide latch functionalities (col. 4 lines 38-45). The controller received the response message and extracts the identification code from the received message and provide the control signal to the lock mechanism when the received security code matches the stored code (col. 4 line 65-col. 5 line 9). The controller therefore performs the interpreting function by translating the received message into a control signal to the lock. Steiner is silent on teaching providing latch diagnostics. Lightner in an art related vehicle diagnostic system for vehicle invention teaches a host computer (12) interfacing with a vehicle system for providing diagnostic including the status of the door lock system (col. 6 lines 36-40) in order to characterized a vehicle performance and to detect problem relating to the operation of the vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the interpreter to provide latch diagnostics in Steiner as evidenced by Lightner et al. because Steiner teaches a wireless control system for a vehicle for controlling the vehicle functionalities and teaches a host computer interfacing with a vehicle system for providing diagnostic including the status of the door lock system in order to characterized a vehicle performance and to detect problem relating to the operation of the vehicle.

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Steiner teaches a wired connection between the interpreter 66 and the transceiver 68 as shown in figure 2.

Claims 5 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steiner US Patent 6577226 in view of Lightner et al. US Patent 6732031 and further in view of Heaston et al. US patent 5748422.

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Steiner teaches a wired connection between the interpreter 66 and the transceiver 68 as shown in figure 2 but is silent on teaching a voltage level shifter for transforming voltage level for communication with the interface component. Heaston et al. in an art related power latch invention teaches the use of a voltage level shifter for transforming a voltage to a desired level (col. 6 lines 21-30) in order to satisfy the voltage level requirement of an interface unit.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a voltage level shifter in Steiner in view of Lightner et al. as evidenced by Heaston et al. because Onuma et al suggests an interpreter interfacing with the transceiver and Heaston et al. teaches the use of a voltage level shifter for transforming a voltage to a desired level in order to satisfy the voltage level requirement of an interface unit.

Claims 6-10, 12, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steiner US Patent 6577226 in view of Lightner et al. US Patent 6732031 and further in view of Knight et al. US Patent 20030167345.

Regarding claims 6-10, 12, and 19-20, Steiner teaches an interface for transmitting and receiving data between the transceiver 68 and the controller (interpreter) 66 as shown in figure 2

Art Unit: 2612

but is silent on teaching the interface comprises a UART. Knight et al. in an art related vehicle communication system invention teaches the use of a UART in the vehicle communication interface (paragraph 00189) and the UART transmits in parallel by assembling the bit received into bytes and transmitting the assembled bytes to the processor (paragraph 0188). Knight et al. further teaches integrating the UART and having the UART separate (paragraph 0164) based on the desired application.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the interface to comprise a UART in Steiner in view of Lightner et al. as evidenced Knight et al. because Steiner suggests an interface for transmitting and receiving data between the transceiver 68 and the controller and Knight teaches the use of a UART in a vehicle communication system in order to facilitate the transfer of data between devices with different communication protocol.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2612

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vernal U. Brown whose telephone number is 571-272-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on 571-272-⁷³⁰⁸~~3998~~. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vernal Brown
April 3, 2006



WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2500